



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/104,942 06/25/98 SPIEGEL

J 120087.404

EXAMINER

TM02/0703

PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 3RD AVENUE, SUITE 4800
SEATTLE WA 98101-3099

PATEL, I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164
DATE MAILED:

07/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/104,942

Applicant(s)

SPIEGEL et al

Examiner

Jagdish Patel

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 25, 1998
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-848) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6,7 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 54-57 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 54-55 recite .."wherein no electronic commerce context is initially provided". This limitation contradicts with "selecting one of a plurality of electronic commerce contexts.." which is predicated on a plurality of electronic commerce contexts.

Claims 56-57 recite.."wherein only one electronic commerce context is initially provided". This limitation contradicts with "selecting one of a plurality of electronic commerce contexts.." which is predicated on a plurality of electronic commerce contexts.

Similar deficiency also exists for claims 68-71 in relation to "interaction contexts".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2164

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chelliah et al. (US Pat. 5,710,887) (hereafter Chelliah).

Claim 7. Chelliah discloses a method in a computer system for conducting electronic commerce, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of electronic commerce contexts for a user, each electronic commerce context having information relating to electronic commerce conducted while in that electronic commerce context (Chelliah, choice of "electronic storefronts 14" , Fig. 1 and col. 6 L 5-36, plurality of electronic commerce contexts are a plurality of storefronts 14);

receiving from the user a selection of one of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts (col. 6 L 37-40, customer selects a particular store by selecting its store front);

after receiving the selection of the one of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts, conducting electronic commerce with the user (col. 6 L 44-48); and

associating, with the selected electronic commerce context, information relating to the electronic commerce conducted with the user so that when the user subsequently selects that selected electronic commerce context from the plurality of electronic commerce contexts, the associated information is available for conducting subsequent electronic commerce (col. 7 L 17-23).

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 8: Chelliah while teaching that the electronic commerce includes selecting items (col. 6 L 44-46) and the information relating to the electronic commerce includes the identity of the items previously selected (col. 14 L 63- col. 15 L 5).

Claim 17. The method of claim 7 wherein each electronic commerce context has associated billing information relating to electronic commerce conducted while in that electronic commerce context (Chelliah col. 12 L 56-65)

Claim 18. The method of claim 7 wherein each electronic commerce context has associated shipment information relating to electronic commerce conducted while in that electronic commerce context (Chelliah col. 12 L 67- col. 13 L 9) .

Claim 19 : The method of claim 7 wherein the receiving of a selection includes sending to the user an indication of each of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts (Chelliah col. 6 L 14-28-31, storefront 1, storefront 2..etc. as shown in Figure 1 a choice of electronic store fronts).

Claim 20: The method of claim 19, wherein the sent indications are to be displayed simultaneously to the user for selection of one of the indications (col. 6 L 37-40).

Claim 28: wherein the user indicates that another user can access information associated with an electronic commerce context (Chelliah col. 7 L 24-30, shared repository).

Claims 29,30 and 36-39 have been analyzed as in claims 7,8 and 17-20 respectively.

Claims 40 and 41 have been analyzed as in claims 7 and 8 respectively.

Claim 45 : Chelliah teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2164

selecting one of a plurality of electronic commerce contexts for a user (col. 6 L 37-43);
and

after selecting an electronic commerce context, conducting electronic commerce with the user (col. 6 L 44-48)

whereby the conducted electronic commerce is associated with the selected electronic commerce context (the electronic commerce context is storefront 14, selected by Internal commerce subsystem 16 to represent the store's interactions with the customer, col. 6 L 40-43)

Claim 46. The method of claim 45 including displaying selection navigation information that indicates each of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts (Refer to Fig. 1, user interface discussed in col. 6 L 26-43).

Claim 48. The method of claim 45 wherein each electronic commerce context has an associated electronic shopping cart (Chelliah col. 14 L 63-65).

Claim 49. The method of claim 45 wherein the conducting of electronic commerce includes selecting items to purchase (Chelliah col. 6 L 44-46).

Claim 50. The method of claim 45 wherein each of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts has associated information relating to electronic commerce conducted while that electronic commerce context was selected (Chelliah col. 6 L 59-65).

Claim 51. The method of claim 45 including displaying viewing navigation information that indicates each of the plurality of electronic commerce contexts (Chelliah col. 12 L 30-42).

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 52. The method of claim 51 wherein when an electronic commerce context is selected from the viewing navigation information, information relating to that electronic commerce context is displayed (Chelliah col. 12 L 30-42).

Claim 53. The method of claim 45 wherein the user supplies an identifier for each electronic commerce context ("customer information", col. 6 L 59-65).

Claim 58: The method of claim 45 wherein multiple electronic commerce contexts are initially provided (col. 6 L 26-31..."choice of displayed electronic store fronts 14.").

3. Claims 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being clearly anticipated by Yagasaki (US Pat. 6,125,353) (hereafter Yagasaki).

Claim 59. Yagasaki teaches a method for interacting with a computer, the method comprising:

selecting one of a plurality of interaction contexts for a user (refer to Figure 1, item 21, which is a product search screen data which includes categories of products 21a selected for user , also refer to Fig. 9 item s3)

after selecting an interaction context, interacting with the user, whereby the interacting is associated with the selected interaction context (col. 4 L 12-24)).

Claim 60. The method of claim 59 including displaying selection navigation information that indicates each of the plurality of interaction contexts (Figure 1 item 21a which indicates each of the plurality of product categories, col. 3 L 24-33).

Art Unit: 2164

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa et al. (US Pat. 5,905,973) (hereafter Yonezawa) and further in view of Yagasaki (US Pat. 6,125,353) (hereafter Yagasaki).

Regarding claim 1, Yonezawa discloses a method in a computer system for conducting electronic commerce ("an online shopping system", abstract), the method comprising:

providing a shopping cart having an indication of items currently within the electronic shopping cart and billing and shipment information (shopping basket function capable of order process...col. 4 L 56- col. 5 L 12);

generating a display that identifies the electronic shopping cart (col. 5 L 46-53, numeral 602...shopping basket ID);

sending the generated display to a user computer system (refer to Fig. 1, generated display is sent to the shopping client and displayed on display device 102, col. 3 L 32-37);

receiving a selection of electronic shopping cart from the user computer system (col. 6 L 10-14);

receiving a selection of an item from the user computer system (col. 7 L 29-37);

Art Unit: 2164

in response to receiving the selection of the item, adding the item to the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 7 L 33-41);

receiving an indication to checkout the items in the selected electronic shopping cart from the user computer system (col. 8 L 4-6, ..selection of the order button..., step 826);

and in response to receiving the indication to checkout, shipping the items in the selected electronic shopping cart in accordance with the shipment information of the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 8 L 4-6..process to order the item in the shopping basket); and

billing for the items in the selected electronic shopping cart in accordance with the billing information for the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 8 L 4-6 recites “process to order the item”, col. 7 L 37-46 recites the shopping server calculates “the current total amount”).

Yonezawa, while teaches all elements of a method for conducting electronic commerce it only teaches the claimed invention in the framework of a single shopping cart instead of a plurality of shopping carts. Yonezawa thus fails to teach that the disclosed computer system provides a plurality of shopping carts as recited. Consequently, Yonezawa also fails to teach associated method steps of “providing a plurality of ..shopping carts..”, “generating a display that identifies and method steps applicable to individual shopping cart (e.g. a selected shopping cart,) selection of one of the identified electronic shopping carts etc.. Yagasaki, in the same field of endeavor, however, teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce having multiple categories (shopping carts). Yagasaki when considered in view of Yonezawa also teaches basis for metaphorical representation of a plurality of stores (whose information is stored in mall server 30) in a shopping cart format because products are classified in a plurality of categories (col. 4 L 12-

Art Unit: 2164

37, also refer to Figure 2 and 3). Thus, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention, to extend the shopping cart method of Yonezawa to a plurality of categories of products as disclosed in Yagasaki reference to formulate a method of electronic commerce having a plurality of shopping carts as disclosed. The motivation for the combination is to provide to the customer a multiple and distinct categories of merchandise for purchase in a shopping cart format making it convenient for the customer to select both the products and billing and shipping method suitable for the selected product categories.

5. Claims 1- 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Pat. 5,960,411) (hereafter Hartman) and further in view of Yagasaki (US Pat. 6,125,353) (hereafter Yagasaki).

Regarding claim 1 , Hartman discloses a method in a computer system for conducting electronic commerce ("a method for ..to purchase an item via the Internet", abstract), the method comprising:

providing a shopping cart having an indication of items currently within the electronic shopping cart and billing and shipment information (col. 2 L 17-18, col. 1 L 57-62);

generating a display that identifies the electronic shopping cart (..unique client identifier..col. 3 L 37-38);

sending the generated display to a user computer system (col. 3 L 49-56);

Art Unit: 2164

receiving a selection of electronic shopping cart from the user computer system (in a single shopping cart format the selection of the shopping cart is also single action ordering performed by the purchaser, col. 3 L 56-60);

receiving a selection of an item from the user computer system (col. 3 L 601-64);

in response to receiving the selection of the item, adding the item to the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 3 L 60-64);

receiving an indication to checkout the items in the selected electronic shopping cart from the user computer system (col. 4 L 59-62);

and in response to receiving the indication to checkout, shipping the items in the selected electronic shopping cart in accordance with the shipment information of the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 5 L 66- col. 6 L 4, col. 7 L 25-29); and

billing for the items in the selected electronic shopping cart in accordance with the billing information for the selected electronic shopping cart (col. 7 L 25-29, ..., purchaser specific order information...to complete the order).

Hartman, while teaches all elements of a method for conducting electronic commerce it only teaches the claimed invention in the framework of a single shopping cart instead of a plurality of shopping carts. Hartman thus fails to teach that the disclosed computer system provides a plurality of shopping carts as recited. Consequently, Yonezawa also fails to teach associated method steps of “providing a plurality of ..shopping carts..”, “generating a display that identifies and method steps applicable to individual shopping cart (e.g. a selected shopping cart,) selection of one of the identified electronic shopping carts etc.. Yagasaki, in the same field of endeavor,

Art Unit: 2164

however, teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce having multiple categories (shopping carts). Yagasaki when considered in view of Yonezawa also teaches basis for metaphorical representation of a plurality of stores (whose information is stored in mall server 30) in a shopping cart format because products are classified in a plurality of categories (col. 4 L 12-37, also refer to Figure 2 and 3). Thus, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention, to extend the shopping cart method of Yonezawa to a plurality of categories of products as disclosed in Yagasaki reference to formulate a method of electronic commerce having a plurality of shopping carts as disclosed. The motivation for the combination is to provide to the customer a multiple and distinct categories of merchandise for purchase in a shopping cart format making it convenient for the customer to select both the products and billing and shipping method suitable for the selected product categories.

Claim 2. : ..wherein the user can provide an identifier for each electronic shopping cart (Hartman, col. 6 L 16-19)

Claim 3. : The method of claim 1 including tracking activity performed by the user while each electronic shopping cart is selected (Hartman, col. 4 L 46-58).

Claim 4. : The method of claim 1 wherein, after receiving a selection of an electronic shopping cart, modifying a display based on information relating to the selected electronic shopping cart (Hartman col. 4 L 59-64).

Claim 5. : The method of claim 1 wherein the user selects one of the plurality of electronic shopping carts with a single action (Hartman col. 5 L 15-25).

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 6. The method of claim 1 wherein the selection of an item and the indication to checkout the item is performed by a single action (Hartman, col. 3 L 56-60).

6. Claims 9-13, 31-33 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chelliah and Levine as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of LeRoy et al. (US Pat. 5,970,474) (hereafter LeRoy) .

Claims 9-11: Chelliah or Levine fail to teach presenting to another user a recommendation for items as recited in claims 9-11.

LeRoy, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method of electronic comprising the method steps as recited in claims 10 and 11 including presenting to another user a recommendation for items based on items previously selected by the user while in a certain electronic commerce context (LeRoy col. 3 L 17-19).

It would have been obvious at the time of the claimed invention to implement the claimed feature of information including the identity of the items previously selected by a user (registrant) in order that this section of items be communicated to a second user (a purchasing customer) for example to communicate the user desired items to the second user, thereby enabling the second user to make selection of gifts desired by the first user.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 12 and 13. The method of claim 8 including providing to another user a list of items selected in one of the electronic commerce contexts (LeRoy col. 3 L 17-19) . Also refer to analysis of claims 8 and 9.

Claims 31-33 and claims 42-44 have been analyzed as in claims 9-11 respectively.

7. Claims 15,16,34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chelliah as applied to claim above 7, and further in view of Levine et al.. (US Pat. 5,745,681) (hereafter Levine) .

Claim 15 and 16 : Chelliah fails to teach ..persist storing the information..as recited , however, in same field of endeavor, Levine teaches... wherein the user establishes a connection when conducting electronic commerce and including persistently storing the information so that the information is available when the user next establishes a connection (Levine Col. 2 L 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the information related to the electronic commerce in order that the user will be able to complete a previously incomplete or abandoned transaction as has been alluded by Levine (col. 1 L 37-47).

Claims 34 and 35 have been analyzed as in claims 15 and 16 respectively.

8. Claims 21-27 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chelliah as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Hartman.

Art Unit: 2164

Claims 21, 22: Chelliah fails to disclose that the selection of one of the plurality of contexts is performed with a single action (claim 21) or by a click of a pointing device (claim 22). In the same field of endeavor, however, Hartman teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce, wherein selection of an electronic commerce context (ordering an item) is performed with a single click of a mouse (Hartman col. 4 L 14-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the single action and a single click features to perform the selection of a commerce context as recited in claims 21 and 22 because these feature would minimize the user actions required to perform a selection of a commerce context.

Claims 23-25: Chelliah fails to explicitly teach the feature of including receiving from the user an identifier for an electronic commerce context. However, in the same field of endeavor Hartman teaches an electronic commerce context identified by an identifier received from the user and that each electronic commerce context is from the identifier received from the user (Hartman, col. 4 L 46-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement an identifier for an electronic context. Motivation for this modification would be to track the user activity by distinctly identifying each user and each commerce context selected by the user connected to the server.

Claim 26: Chelliah fails to recite that the electronic commerce method provides for single-action ordering as recited. However, in the same field of endeavor Hartman teaches an

Art Unit: 2164

electronic commerce method wherein single-action is enabled and all single-action ordering is relative to the selected electronic commerce context (col. 3 L 53-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enable the single action ordering and providing all single-action ordering is relative to the selected electronic commerce context because these feature would minimize the user actions required to perform a selection of a commerce context.

Claim 27: wherein when generating a display for single-action ordering, identifying the selected electronic commerce context (Chelliah identifies each storefront col. 6 L 37-40, col. 7 L 17-23).

Claims 47: Chelliah fails to disclose that the selecting of contexts is performed with a single action relating to the displayed selection navigation information. In the same field of endeavor, however, Hartman teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce, wherein selection of an electronic commerce context (ordering an item) is performed with a single click of a mouse (Hartman col. 4 L 14-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the single action and a single click features to perform the selection of a commerce context as recited because these feature would minimize the user actions required to perform a selection of a commerce context.

All other limitations of claim 47 are analyzed as in claim 46.

Art Unit: 2164

9. Claim 61-67 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yagasaki** as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of **Hartman**.

Claim 61 **Yagasaki** fails to disclose that the selection of a interaction contexts is performed with a single action. In the same field of endeavor, however, **Hartman** teaches a method for conducting electronic commerce, wherein selection of an electronic commerce context (ordering an item) is performed with a single click of a mouse (**Hartman** col. 4 L 14-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the single action and a single click features to perform the selection of a interaction context as recited in claim 61 because these feature would minimize the user actions required to perform a selection of a commerce context.

Claim 62. The method of claim 59 wherein the interacting includes use of a search engine (**Yagasaki**, product search screen 52, Fig. 3 col.5 L 7-11).

Claim 63. The method of claim 59 wherein the interacting includes conducting of electronic commerce (...and place a order for the product." col. 4 L 12-24).

Claim 64. The method of claim 59 wherein each of the plurality of interaction contexts has associated information relating to interactions engaged in while that interaction context was

Art Unit: 2164

selected (associated information is product master table 33 shown in Fig. 3, col. 4 L 38-51, also refer to per-store count, col. 5 L 14-16).

Claim 65. The method of claim 59 including displaying viewing navigation information that indicates each of the plurality of interaction contexts (Figure 3, product search screen 52, per-store count screen at customer terminal 50).

Claim 66. The method of claim 65 wherein when an interaction context is selected from the viewing navigation information, information relating to that interaction context is displayed (Fig. 3, product list screen 54 at customer terminal 50).

Claim 67. The method of claim 59 wherein the user supplies an identifier for each interaction context (identifier for each interaction context is supplied by the user via order entry screen 55).

Claim 72. The method of claim 59 wherein multiple interaction contexts are initially provided (multiple interaction context are categories of products 21a on product search screen 21 as shown in Fig. 1).

10. Claim 73-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chelliah** as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of **Yagasaki**.

Art Unit: 2164

Regarding claims 73-76: Chelliah discloses a method in a computer system for conducting electronic commerce as per claim 7 (claim 29 applicable to claims 77-80) analysis presented above. Chelliah, however, fails to teach that the electronic commerce context is selected to a specific scope and that the scope is specified by a filter and further limiting includes displaying and purchasing only those items that satisfy a certain criteria. Yagasaki, in the same field of endeavor discloses a method of conducting electronic commerce. Yagasaki teaches electronic commerce context is selected to a specific scope, displaying and allowing purchase of only those items.. (selected category as shown in Figure 1, item 21, col. 3 L 24-42), scope is specified by a filter (category selection menu excludes..not suitable for the present time of the year col. 3 L 41-42, Fig. 1 category master table having starting date and ending date..).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement limiting selection of the electronic commerce context to a specified scope and applying filter as claimed. Motivation for these modification to Chelliah method is that it provides the user with less cumbersome and efficient method of product selection for purchase because the scope of the electronic commerce is already preselected.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2164

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chislenko et al (US Pat. 6,092,049) discloses a method for recommending items to users using automated collaborative filtering stores profiles of users relating rating to items in memory.

Hey (US Pat. 4,996,642) discloses a system and method for recommending items for users selected from a group of users.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jagdish Patel whose telephone number is (703) 308-7837. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin, can be reached at (703) 308-1065.

The fax number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2700 is (703) 308-9051 or 9052. Draft or Informal faxes for this Art Unit can be submitted to (703) 308-5397.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JNP 06/30/01


VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100